

### REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11-16, 18-19, 21-54, and 56-59 were previously pending in this application. Claims 25 and 56 have been cancelled by this amendment, and claims 10, 17, 20, and 55 were previously cancelled. Claims 26 and 27 have been amended to correct their dependencies because of cancelled claim 25, and claim 51 has been amended to correct its dependency to claim 50. Accordingly, claims 1-9, 11-16, 18-19, 21-24, 26-54, and 57-59 are now pending in this application.

Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Applicants note that U.S. Patent No. 6,816,715 to Mano (hereafter “*Mano*”) cited by the Examiner in the Office Action dated November 3, 2006, has not yet been listed on a form PTO-892. Thus, Applicants request an updated form PTO-892 with *Mano* listed therein.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-9, 11-16, 18-19, 21-54, and 56-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,859,878 to Phillips et al. (hereafter “*Phillips*”) in view of the article by Murphy et. al. entitled “Satellite-Based Guidance for Precision Approach and Landing of Commercial Aircraft,” GPS Solutions, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 21-26, 1998 (hereafter “*Murphy*”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the digital signal processor is “directly coupled to said digital down converter.” Support for this limitation is found in Figure 1 of the application as filed, where digital signal processor 30 is shown directly coupled to digital down converter 28. Independent claims 18, 29, 34, 43, 46, 53, and 57 have been amended to recite similar limitations as in claim 1 related to the digital signal processor being “directly coupled to said digital down converter.”

There is no teaching or suggestion in *Phillips* of a digital signal processor “directly coupled” to a digital down converter as recited in the present independent claims. Rather, *Phillips* teaches a digital down converter (DDC) 210 directly coupled to a field-programmable gate array (FPGA) 206, and a digital signal processor (DSP) 216 directly coupled to FPGA 206

or indirectly coupled to FPGA 206 through a bus 218 (*see* Figures 3A, 8A). There is also no teaching or suggestion in *Murphy* of a digital signal processor “directly coupled” to a digital down converter as recited in the present independent claims.

Thus, even if the teachings of *Phillips* are combined with the teachings of *Murphy* as suggested by the Examiner, not all of the limitations of the present independent claims are met. Accordingly, the present independent claims would not have been obvious over *Phillips* in view of *Murphy*. As each of the present dependent claims include the limitations of their respective independent claims, the present dependent claims would also not have been obvious over *Phillips* in view of *Murphy* for the foregoing reasons.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-9, 11-16, 18-19, 21-54, and 56-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at 612-332-4720.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 26, 2007

/Gregory M. Taylor/

Gregory M. Taylor  
Reg. No. 34,263

Attorneys for Applicants  
Fogg & Powers LLC  
P.O. Box 581339  
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1339  
T – (612) 332-4720  
F – (612) 332-4731